## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY REC'D 0.7 MON 2005

From the	TIONAL SEAD	PLING AT IPE	ם זידיני			LITOD O L 140A	2003
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  To: ANGELA DALLAS SEBOR					PC	ЖIРО :	PC
	A DALLAS SEBO AN ROSS P.C.	JK			<b>.</b> .	<b>∠ ⊥</b>	
	OADWAY, SUIT			WRITTEN OPINION OF THE			
DENVER, CO 80202-5141				INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY			
					(PCT Rule	43 <i>bis</i> .1)	
				Date of mailing (day/month/year)	0 9	3 NOV 2005	
Applicant	t's or agent's file	reference		FOR FURTHER ACTION			
2997-74-1	PCT			See paragraph 2 below			
Internatio	onal application N	o. I	nternational filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (	day/month/year)	
PCT/US0			9 January 2005 (19.01.	1.2005) 19 January 2004 (19.01.2004)			
Internatio	onal Patent Classif	ication (IPC) or 1	both national classificat	ion and IPC			
	61K 31/20 and U	S Cl.: 514/558					
Applicant							
MARTEK	K BIOSCIENCES	CORPORATIO	N		····	-	
1. This	opinion contains i	ndications relati	ng to the following item	s:	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
	Box No. I	Basis of the or	oinion				
	Box No. II	Priority					
	Box No. III	Non-establish	nent of opinion with re	gard to novelty, inver	ntive step and inc	dustrial applicability	,
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity	of invention				
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
	Box No. VI	Certain docum	ents cited				
	Box No. VII	Certain defects	s in the international app	olication			
	Box No. VIII	Certain observ	ations on the internation	nal application			
2 FUR	THER ACTIO						
2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.							
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.							
	ırther options, see				4		
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.							
Name and	mailing address o	of the ISA/ US	Date of complet	ion of this opinion	Aythorized office	cer Ministral Ma	thete
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US					Šreepivasan Pa	W. Coo.	7
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450		22 Deptember 20	, , ,		702 209 1225		

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2005)

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.	
PCT/US05/02177	

Box No. I Basis of this opinion							
1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:							
$\boxtimes$	the international application in the language in which it was filed						
	a translation of the international application into, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).						
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:							
a.	type of material						
	a sequence listing						
	table(s) related to the sequence listing						
ъ.	format of material						
	on paper						
	in electronic form						
c.	time of filing/furnishing						
	contained in the international application as filed.						
	filed together with the international application in electronic form.						
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.						
3.	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.						
4. Addit	ional comments:						

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/02177

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

	1 3	
1. Statement		
Novelty (N)	Claims 1-123	YES
	Claims NONE	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims <u>1-123</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-123	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

## 2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-123 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a claimed method comprising mechanism of the deficiency or dysfunctions of Reelin deficiency.

Claims 1-123 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over HORROBIN (U.S.Patent No. 5,516,800) in view of BRADLEY et al. (U.S.Patent No. 6,197,764 B1).

HORROBIN teaches treatment of negative symptoms of schizophrenia can be treated with the combination comprising docosahexaenoic acid. (abstract)

BRADLBY et al. teach a composition comprising docosahexaenoic acid useful for the treatment of psychological disorders such as schizophrenia.

Neither reference teaches the mechanism of action of effecting Reelin deficiency or dysfunction.

The mechanism of action of effecting Reelin deficiency or dysfunction is obvious because the mechanism by which the active ingredient gives the pharmacological effect does not alter the fact that the same compound has been previously used to obtain the same pharmacological effects which would result from the claimed method of treating schizophrenia. The patient, condition to be treated and the effect are the same. An explanation of why that effect occurs does not make novel or even unobvious the treatment of the conditions encompassed by the claims.

Claims 1-123 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4) since a method to treat a Reelin deficiency or dysfunction, comprising administering to a patient diagnosed with or suspected of having a Reelin deficiency or dysfunction an amount of a polyunsaturated fatty acid (PUDA) to compensate for the effects of Reelin deficiency or dysfunction in the patient has an industrial applicability in pharmaceutical art.